

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/005,020	12/03/2001	David W. Smithey	7647-000024	9692	
27572	7590 09/09/2003				
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 828			ATKINSON, CHRISTOPHER MARK		
BLOOMFIEL	BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			Trianson, omes or new mar	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3743		
			DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003	ı	
				~	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. Applicant(s)

10 005, 020 Smithey etal.

Examiner Atkinson 3743

The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	41.4
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
mailing date of this communication.	apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Thi	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under E	nce except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is farte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s)	is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) (L) Claims	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.
10) The drawing(s) filed oni	s/are a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b): disapproved by the Examiner
If approved, corrected drawings are required in a	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International *See the attached detailed Office action for a list	rity documents have been received in this National Stage Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not received.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language prov	
	nestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachment(s)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6}

Application/Control Number: 10/005,020 Page 2

Art Unit: 3743

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-24, drawn to a heat exchanger, classified in class 165, subclass 179.

II. Claims 25-37, drawn to a method of manufacturing a heat exchanger, classified in class

29, subclass 890.046.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group II and Group I are related as process of making and product made. The

inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as

claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as

claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the

instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such

as molding, etching, machining or stamping.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application also discloses and contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

(A) The species as illustrated in Figures 1-3

B) The species as illustrated in Figures 4-6

Application/Control Number: 10/005,020 Page 3

Art Unit: 3743

C) The species as illustrated in Figures 7-9

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention (e.g. Group I and species A) to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Application/Control Number: 10/005,020 Page 4

Art Unit: 3743

should be directed to Christopher Atkinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2603. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

9/3/2002

CHRISTOPHER ATKINSON PRIMARY EXAMINER